

To: Kumar, Ashij (EC)[ashij.kumar@canada.ca]; Norman G Grannemann[nggranne@usgs.gov]
Cc: VanStempvoort, Dale (EC)[dale.vanstempvoort@canada.ca]; Schardt, James[schardt.james@epa.gov]
From: Grannemann, Norman
Sent: Mon 6/13/2016 8:21:10 PM
Subject: Re: GW sub-indicator work for PRP chapter?
A08 of PRP MASTER - May 19 2016 (2).docx

Hi Ash,
 Thanks for reminding me of this. I have added a paragraph in blue type to the attached file. See what you think about the wording.
 Best regards.
 Norm

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 11:05 AM, Kumar, Ashij (EC) <ashij.kumar@canada.ca> wrote:

Norm & Dale, when you get chance, can I get an update on this additional text you were preparing for the Progress Report of the Parties that would talk about the GW indicator work?

Any chance it'd be ready this week / early next week?

Ash

From: Kumar, Ashij (EC)
Sent: May 19, 2016 9:18 AM
To: 'Grannemann, Norman'
Cc: VanStempvoort, Dale (EC); schardt.james@epa.gov; 'Cherwaty-Pergentile, Stacey [Burlington]'; Stadler-Salt, Nancy (EC)
Subject: RE: GW sub-indicator work for PRP chapter?

Norm, I guess that depends on if, in the end/after this work is done, you have 1 GW Indicator or couple sub-indicators that make up the 1 GW Indicator that reports against General Objective #8... but I'd defer to the SOGL folks re. this.

If you provide the text that you and Dale and comfortable with to be included in Annex 8 PRP chapter, I'm sure Stacey/Nancy can confirm the indicator terminology.

Ash

From: Grannemann, Norman [<mailto:nggranne@usgs.gov>]

Sent: May 19, 2016 9:09 AM
To: Kumar, Ashij (EC); Norman G Grannemann
Cc: VanStempvoort, Dale (EC); schardt.james@epa.gov
Subject: Re: GW sub-indicator work for PRP chapter?

Hi Ash, Dale, and Jamie,

I hope all is going well for you.

I agree that not including the GW Indicator in the report is an oversight. I think it belongs in the section titled "Coordinate binational groundwater activities . . ." We are making good progress on this and it should be noted. The one question I have is about the indicator title. I think that this should be referred to as an "indicator" not a "sub-indicator" since the GW Annex only has one component. We do, however, use Cl and NO3 as measures of the indicator. Do I have the terminology right here?

Thanks for all the help on this.

Best regards.

Norm

On Thu, May 19, 2016 at 7:19 AM, Kumar, Ashij (EC) <ashij.kumar@canada.ca> wrote:

Dale & Norm, we received a comment re. your Annex 8 PRP chapter re. the GW sub-indicator work which should/could be mentioned as a binational activity from the SOGL staff (comment below in blue). Do you think this should be added and if so can you provide a short bullet and insert it into the appropriate spot under the appropriate commitment box.

"No mention of work to assess groundwater quality via a sub-indicator report and to measure progress towards GO 8. Surprised but not sure where it would best fit, possibly under "Coordinate binational groundwater activities under the GLWQA with domestic groundwater programs to assess, protect and manage groundwater impacting the waters of the Great Lakes." But could also fit under "Assess information gaps and science needs related to groundwater to protect the quality of Waters of the Great Lakes." since part of the sub-indicator work to date has noted that we lack the data needed to do a complete assessment."

Ash

--

Norman Grannemann

USGS Great Lakes Program Coordinator

6520 Mercantile Way, Suite 5

Lansing, MI 48911

517 887 8936 (desk)

517 974 2106 (cell)

--

Norman Grannemann

USGS Great Lakes Program Coordinator

6520 Mercantile Way, Suite 5

Lansing, MI 48911

517 887 8936 (desk)

517 974 2106 (cell)